DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 399 317 UD 031 280

AUTHOR Englert, Richard M.

TITLE The University's Role in the Improvement of Inner-City Education: A Perspective from the University. Publication Series #96-8.

INSTITUTION Coordinating Centre for Regional Information Training, Nairobi (Kenya).; Temple Univ., Philadelphia, PA. National Education Center on Education in the Inner Cities.

SPONS AGENCY Office of Educational Research and Improvement (ED), Washington, DC.

PUB DATE 96

NOTE 37p.; Paper presented at the Wingspread Conference on "Next Steps in Inner-City Education" (Racine, WI, October 19-21, 1995).

PUB TYPE Reports - Evaluative/Feasibility (142) -- Speeches/Conference Papers (150)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.

DESCRIPTORS *Access to Education; Agenda Setting; *College Role; College School Cooperation; Disadvantaged Youth; *Educational Improvement; Elementary Secondary Education; Higher Education; *Inner City; Interaction; Needs Assessment; *School Community Relationship; School Role; *Urban Education; Urban Problems; Urban Schools

ABSTRACT

The relationship between the university and the city is explored and implications are drawn for the university's role in improving inner-city education. The article assumes that there is such an institution as the "urban university" within a major city and having a significant level of interchange with it. There are tension points between cities and urban universities that constitute barriers to productive joint efforts to improve urban education; some of the most intractable disputes involve real estate and location. A 31-goal agenda is proposed that asks the urban university to provide a quality higher education for urban residents, provide university students with city experience, prepare urban professionals, develop a knowledge base for urban improvement, provide essential services for city residents, act as a good neighbor, and be a social critic and an agent of public policy. The first thing the urban university should do is to make certain that it provides access to urban students. Reclaiming the public trust and organizing urban improvement efforts are key elements of the university's role in urban education. However, each urban university must set its priorities in accord with its autonomy. (Contains 82 references.) (SLD)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED 399 317

The University's Role in the Improvement of Inner-City Education: A Perspective from the University

by Richard M. Englert

The National Center on Education in the Inner Cities

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

☒ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

Paper presented at theWingspread Conference on "Next Steps in Inner-City Education," Racine, Wisconsin, October 19, 20 & 21, 1995

The research reported herein was supported in part by the Office of Educational Research and Improvement (OERI) of the U.S. Department of Education through a grant to the National Center on Education in the Inner Cities (CEIC) at the Temple University Center for Research in Human Development and Education (CRHDE). The opinions expressed do not necessarily reflect the position of the supporting agencies, and no official endorsement should be inferred.

 # 96-8

UD031280

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

THE UNIVERSITY'S ROLE IN THE IMPROVEMENT OF INNER-CITY EDUCATION

by

Richard M. Englert
Temple University

This article's purpose is twofold: (a) to discuss the relationship between the university and the city and (b) to explore implications for the university's role in improving inner-city education. This analysis is primarily from the viewpoint of the university. The "city" is viewed here loosely as the totality of the local environment, including city government, the schools, community organizations, corporations, businesses, and neighborhoods near campus, that is, what lies locally outside the university.

This article assumes there is such an institution as an "urban university"--located within a major city and having a significant level of interchange with it. The urban university's boundaries spill out into its immediate neighborhood, the inner city. A significant percentage of the urban university's students and employees are from underrepresented racial and ethnic minority groups, many living in the city. And the urban university has a special commitment to inner-city education.

Part One: The University: Traditional and Emerging

The characteristic that best describes American institutions of higher education is their diversity. Nationwide there are over 3,600 colleges and universities, which have emerged because of historical factors including fierce economic competition, establishment of colleges by special interest groups, governance mechanisms favoring institutional autonomy, and an absence of strong regulatory mechanisms at the state and national levels. The result is a higher education "system" in which the economic marketplace is the main unifying force and institutions find their niches in response to constituency needs (Trow, 1989).

In response to competitive diversity, American higher education has developed characteristic structures. These include lay governing boards, a relatively powerful presidency, strong institutional autonomy, a unit credit system with easily transportable academic credits, tenure, academic freedom, degree- and credential-granting authority, disciplinary-based academic departments, specialization and decentralization, democratization of access, a multiplicity of courses, programs, goals and objectives,

and services to meet the needs of American society (Berdahl, 1989; Birnbaum, 1983; Kerr,1963; Trow, 1989).

Higher education structures are evolving in response to demands in the economic marketplace and political system. Some dominant trends are: growing dependence on private markets for certain services; a tendency for states to question the costs of higher education, to require more accountability, and to redefine their relationships to higher education, with a growing dependence on a "state-aided" model for public institutions; innovative partnerships within higher education, even the mergers and acquisitions characteristic of American business and health care corporations in recent years; the reconfiguring of the relations of health sciences centers to the rest of the university; placing greater financial authority in decentralized units with a focus on responsibility center management and the paring of administrative overhead; including more governmental, regulatory, and outside actors to determine the directions and activities of higher education; and recognizing many universities as large, complex, international conglomerates, not unlike major private sector corporations (Duderstadt, 1995).

Other trends include: a focus on customer satisfaction and a definition of quality from the vantage point of the consumer; changing learning technologies involving telecommunications, computing, and multimedia integration; an emphasis on lifelong learning, individualized learning modalities, teaching strategies associated with identified student learning styles, cooperative learning, and a results orientation, including new assessment and value-added approaches (Green & Gilbert, 1995); and greater focus on undergraduate teaching (Boyer, 1990).

These trends will likely result in further diversification and reconfiguration of higher education functions and structures as institutions take advantage of opportunities in the economic marketplace and respond to political pressures. This diversification will have multiple implications for initiatives for improving inner-city education. The level of urban education commitment of a university will

increasingly depend on whether it perceives contributions to the city to be part of its economic niche. Institutional considerations, more than the predilections of individual faculty, will predominate.

Part Two: Areas of Tension between Cities and Universities

There are tension points between cities and urban universities that constitute barriers for productive joint efforts to improve urban education. These tensions can be summarized under the following categories: autonomy, governance, complexity and pluralism, competition for resources, expansion, and unequal partnerships.

Autonomy

Universities are highly protective of their independence. Although geographically within the boundaries of local government authority, they are usually chartered or otherwise established by state law. As Berdahl (1989) said, higher education has traditionally exhibited intellectual independence (i.e., academic freedom), substantive autonomy (i.e., freedom to determine its academic directions), and considerable procedural autonomy (i.e., wide administrative latitude to implement its programs and services). Cities are equally protective of their jurisdiction. Although city authority is legally determined by state constitution and legislation and city charter, city officials like to think they have a local mandate to govern within local boundaries and resent encroachment from any other source.

Governance Styles

Differing styles of governance can also be points of tension. The city and the university have distinctive decision-making processes. Cities are governed through unique blends of executive and legislative authority. School districts, reporting to elected or appointed school boards, often have some independence from the rest of city government. Decision-making authority and the power to implement decisions are distributed in a manner distinctive to each city and are checked somewhat by the civil service system and unionized labor. Highly bureaucratic structures are found throughout city subunits.

University governance, meanwhile, is fragmented and decentralized. Ultimate authority rests with an independent, lay board of trustees, which delegates substantial authority to the president and the administration. Authority is also delegated to school, college, and departmental structures and the faculty through the faculty senate (also through a faculty union in some cases). Student government and nonfaculty employee groups also influence institutional decision making (Mason, 1972).

Complexity and Pluralism

Cities and universities exhibit a complexity and pluralism not fully appreciated by outsiders. Each entails numerous uncoordinated, even disjointed projects, initiatives, and groups of constituencies. As the Carnegie Commission on Higher Education (1972) noted: "It is difficult for two very complex entities--the city and the campus--to mesh their actions; they are both pluralistic and anarchic constellations of activities" (p. 2). When universities interact with cities, they relate to a variety of actors, such as political leaders, government officials, school district personnel and community members near campus. Similarly, universities have a variety of interests, including faculty, students, alumni, donors, and unions. Many university people have dual memberships--as neighbors and as employees or students. Both cities and universities are "incompletely bounded fields of contention, comprising various traditions, interests, and ideals" (Bender, 1988, 290-1).

Competition for Resources

Cities and universities compete for financial resources. They are rivals for grants and contracts from federal, state, foundation, corporate, and other sources. Some city businesses resent that university-run businesses, indirectly subsidized by public dollars, compete with them. A source of financial tension is the exemption of most university property from municipal taxes. Cities perceive universities as wealthy institutions that use municipal services without footing the bill. Universities believe they make valuable contributions to the city, in the way of educational, cultural, health, and social services that compensate for the lack of tax revenue (Healy, 1995).

The Problem of Expansion

Some of the most intractable disputes between city residents and universities involve issues of location and real estate. Expansion of the university into adjacent neighborhoods causes immediate displacement for residents and enormous long-term ill-will (Berube, 1978). When it does acquire property, a university often does not immediately invest in renovations, so the property remains vacant. This disrupts the neighborhood and leads to more acquisition by the university as other properties become available. At the same time, the university boundaries are often used for such purposes as parking and fraternity/sorority houses, and the university campus itself disrupts the normal flow of traffic and social interaction in the adjacent neighborhood (Carnegie Commission, 1972). As Doxiades (1969) described, "the boundary areas . . . lose in importance and deteriorate" (pp. 79-80). All of this can contribute to a devaluing of properties near the university, thereby causing an urban decay inimicable to the university's long-term survival.

Unequal Partnerships

Another area of tension arises from perceived unequal partnerships. Some community members complain they feel "used" by university projects in which they participate. Their children, schools, and neighborhoods are "subjects" of research projects which seem to benefit only the university. Their community organizations and leaders are included in externally funded projects, yet most funding seems to go to the university for overhead, faculty pay, and support for students. The perception is that few dollars actually support the participating organizations. Dollars that do flow are eliminated as soon as the projects are completed. There are also complaints that projects are overly narrow, relatively short term, and devoid of long-term investment in the neighborhoods and community.

All these tensions involve a lack of trust. According to Bok (1992), the criticisms heaped upon higher education by the general public, the news media, and a host of iconoclastic authors (e.g., Sykes,

1988; cf. Jayne, 1991) are linked to a loss of public trust in the university. There is no generally acclaimed national goal for which higher education is taking the lead, as it once did with providing access for the GIs returning from World War II and with helping to overtake the Soviet Union in the space race. Bok's message is clear--trust can be quickly eroded without widely shared goals. The challenge is to reclaim the community's trust through a sense of common purpose in the face of important problems that need to be solved.

Part Three: An Agenda to Improve Inner-City Education

Traditionally, the university has described its work in faculty terms--teaching, research, and service--since the faculty member is the technical expert delivering the university's core products and services. There is, however, another way to view university functions--from the viewpoint of the clients or customers served. I propose an agenda, drawn from the Carnegie Commission (1972), calling for the urban university to: (a) provide a quality higher education for urban residents; (b) provide university students with city experiences; (c) prepare urban professionals; (d) develop a knowledge base for urban improvement; (e) provide essential services needed by city residents through model service delivery that is replicable; (f) establish good neighbor policies toward nearby residents; (g) serve as a net economic contributor to the city; (h) maintain a stable and sound organization; (i) provide an open forum and safe haven for opinions and ideas; (j) serve as a frank social critic; and (k) serve as an agent of public policy.

Quality Higher Education for Urban Residents

The first thing an urban university can do to improve inner-city education is to make certain that it provides access for urban students, especially those from underrepresented groups, and that the education it gives them is of the highest quality and supported by an inviting campus environment that aids retention. This involves at least four specific goals.

Goal #1: Providing Access for Urban Populations

An urban university can best serve its host city by educating urban residents (Carnegie Commission, 1972). This means providing access for those who are place-bound, working part-time, and need nontraditional offerings in atypical time blocks and places (Lynton, 1995a). Such access begins with expanding the available pool of potential applicants. An effective outreach strategy is recruiting actively on the turf of potential students, especially through close work with urban public and parochial schools, community colleges, and local community organizations and churches. Successful outreach is based on a coherent recruitment plan which integrates urban recruitment with suburban and out-of-state efforts (Green, 1989). It is critical that admissions standards and procedures not constitute a barrier to urban students. Application procedures must be carefully examined to ensure that they are customer-friendly and that initial contacts with students build positive images (Tinto, 1987). Admissions criteria need to be multidimensional (Green, 1989), and special attention should be paid to careful portrayal of pre-entry expectations, which have been found to relate to later student retention (Tinto, 1987).

Institutions must examine their policies affecting financial affordability for students. There is substantial evidence that broad national policies regarding financial aid for poor students has affected enrollment patterns (Orfield, 1992) and that financial support can make the difference in short-term decisions of students to remain in college once they have decided to enter (Tinto, 1987). Changing fiscal realities have forced institutions to rethink their financial support for low-income students "without any serious analysis of the implications for the character of the institutions or the social equity of the policies" (Orfield, 1992, p. 368). Financial aid is rife with fragmentation, complexity, and confusion. Students and their families need to sort out numerous disjointed programs of federal, state, and private funding--a process favoring students from families with a tradition of attending institutions

of higher education and with the resources and supports needed to investigate college options. The morass of financial aid programs needs coordination, simplification, and consolidation.

Goal #2: Creating An Inviting Campus Climate

Effective retention programs have early contact and transition emphases (such as summer-bridge programs), counseling/advising elements, and integrated first-year components, e.g., small learning communities that build both academic and social relationships (Tinto, 1987). Successful retention of disadvantaged students requires academic and social support programs (Tinto, 1987; Valverde, 1985). Also effective are programs that keep students and their families informed about outside-the-classroom social and intellectual activities and that reach out to the external urban community to build better community understanding about the university's academic programs (Tinto, 1987). Programs aimed at overcoming preparation deficiencies and at reducing the culture shock of transition to college also help students from underrepresented minority populations succeed (Richardson & Skinner, 1991).

Attendance at a college where faculty are student oriented increases student satisfaction and achievement (Astin, 1993). Greater resources need to be targeted at first-year students to help them get a solid start in campus life. In addition, facilities (e.g., lockers, study areas, lounges, small group meeting areas) need to be provided for commuter students to aid in their retention (Carnegie Commission, 1972).

Given the extensive literature on pull-out programs, suspect classifications based on ambiguous criteria, and the need for inclusive systems in basic education (Wang & Reynolds, 1995; Wang, Reynolds, & Walberg, 1994), it is disappointing that there is little comparable research on the effects of special programs in higher education. This is an area needing extensive study, especially since the peer group is a major force in determining overall climate and has pervasive effects on individual students (Astin, 1993).

Goal #3: Ensuring a Responsive Pedagogy

The success of urban students in college depends in large part on the quality of faculty teaching. Traditionally the college instructor teaches the discipline rather than the student. Recent reports and critiques have called for the improvement of undergraduate teaching (e.g., Boyer, 1987; Wingspread Group on Higher Education, 1993). Massy, Wilger, and Colbeck (1994) found that three categories of structural characteristics of academic departments constrained quality teaching: fragmented communication patterns (including personal autonomy bordering on isolation, specialization, superficial civility, generational splits, and personal politics), tight resources, and prevailing methods of evaluation and assessment.

Effective teaching is fostered in academic departments with the following characteristics: a supportive culture, frequent interaction among faculty, faculty tolerance of differences, narrow gaps in work patterns between junior and senior faculty, equity in faculty workload, rotation of courses among faculty, peer and student evaluation of teaching, a balance among incentives, consensual decision-making patterns, and effective leadership by department chairs (Massy et al., 1994). Research is needed to determine the extent to which fragmented, specialized academic department structures enhance or hinder student learning outcomes.

Higher education has yet to systematically adapt the growing knowledge base of successful pedagogy in basic education. Higher education literature has not yet taken the stance that every child can learn, heard for years in basic education. One area in which this is beginning to change is cooperative learning. Bruffee (1987, 1995) compared cooperative and collaborative learning, finding the latter more appropriate for adult-age learners. Others are exploring the importance of value-added approaches and active student learning (Astin, 1993), different learning styles of nontraditional students (Schroeder, 1993), learning communities (Palmer, 1987), and student outcomes (Astin, 1985). These

areas in higher education are beginning to benefit from the more robust knowledge base on teaching and learning in basic education.

Goal #4: Developing a Relevant and Coherent Curriculum

The undergraduate curriculum lacks coherence and is highly fragmented (Boyer, 1987), and college admission standards are disconnected with both basic education (Dilworth & Robinson, 1995) and community colleges (Boyer, 1987). University offerings are often insensitive to the new majority of nontraditional students (Elliott, 1994), and the curriculum lacks sufficient references to people of color. Successful programs for at-risk students, in basic and higher education, view student differences (including racial diversity) as assets on which instruction should capitalize (Dilworth & Robinson, 1995). The availability of minority or third-world courses has a positive effect on key outcome variables, including satisfaction with the overall college experience (Astin, 1993). Inclusion of urban community service programs in the curriculum would better link education with the day-to-day problems and needs of the community (Carnegie Commission, 1972). Further, "multiculturalism is very much on the ascendancy [and likely to remain] a central feature of . . . general education programs for some time" (Gaff, 1992, p. 31). The urban university needs to revise its curriculum to ensure that students experience coherent programs relevant to their worlds and well articulated with prior education, the world of work, and lifelong learning.

Positive Urban Experiences for Students

The urban university has a responsibility to develop models of diversity and provide positive city experiences.

Goal #6: Creating a Diverse Community That Works

The urban university should develop models to foster effective diversity and to demonstrate that diversity works. It has a special role in preparing students to live in a pluralistic society (Hathaway, Mulhollan, & White, 1995). The university can draw on multiple populations for its student body and

faculty; it can build diverse communities of learners and scholars to pursue joint goals in the context of common intellectual values. The university should build bridges among different groups and create an environment to nurture productive interactions (Brownell, 1995). This is congruent with Astin's (1993) analysis that discussion of racial or ethnic issues and socialization with someone from another racial or ethnic group are positively associated with important outcome variables.

Goal #7: Providing Learning Experiences about the City and in the City

Urban universities can provide all students with a better understanding of urban civilization (Carnegie Commission, 1972), and the city can be a laboratory for university students to learn how society works (Cisneros, 1995). Urban studies programs can be useful here, and some institutions have even made urban studies courses part of a core curriculum. Universities have implemented experiential education in the city through internships, practica, and field work, as well as by offering courses at community locations (Ruch & Trani, 1995). Universities also can offer voluntary and required community service opportunities.

Urban Professional Preparation

Goal #8: Preparing Urban Professionals

The university is the prime locus for preparing professionals (Task Force on Teaching as a Profession, 1986), especially urban professionals in medicine, law, dentistry, business, engineering, architecture, and education (Winkler, 1985). The university has a special obligation to help expand the professional pool for those from the city and from traditionally underrepresented populations. The university also must ensure that professionals are not simply technicians but experts capable of applying knowledge in the ambiguous, complex, and unique settings characteristic of city life. As Schon (1983) indicated, professional training must move beyond technical rationality to preparation for reflection-in-action.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Goal #9: Preparing Educators for Urban Schools

Few areas within the university have received such constant criticism as teacher education. The literature on the topic is extensive, especially since the publication of the report of the Carnegie Forum Task Force on Teaching as a Profession (1986) and the first report of the Holmes Group (1986). A decade later, schools of education are still viewed as intractable and not well connected to schools (Sirotnik, 1995). Since teacher education is addressed by another article in this issue, we will here discuss two related issues: rethinking educational administration and coordination across educator preparation programs.

One mark of a profession is concern for the client's well-being. Silver (1983) proposed that educational administration should focus on the problems faced by the profession's clients, not the problems faced by professionals. For the educational administrator, this means the learning problems of students (that is, student outcomes) should be the central concern. The preparation program in educational administration, then, needs to be built on a knowledge base that has at its core student learning outcomes. Kirst and McLaughlin (1990) called for a systematic rethinking of the ways in which services for children and youth are designed and implemented. They suggested that the school be placed at the hub of the array of social services aimed at supporting the child in need; it is the school that should coordinate and integrate multiple social services on the child's behalf. The principal, therefore, needs to be trained to orchestrate and mediate the external forces and services affecting our youth.

Preparation programs for all professional educators need to be better coordinated. The "fragmentation of knowledge, narrow departmentalization, and . . . intense vocationalism" that Boyer (1987, p. 7) found in undergraduate education across the United States is also evident in the specialized programs for preparing professional educators. There are programs for early childhood teachers, elementary teachers, secondary mathematics teachers (with separate ones for each of the other subject

areas at the secondary level), special education, principals, superintendents, school psychologists, and many other specialties. Although these professionals work together in the schools, their preparation programs rarely cross, especially in their clinical work. Wang, Reynolds, and Walberg (1994) called for the coordination of teacher preparation programs, especially those for "regular" and for "special" teachers. Likewise, Schorr (1994) recommended that professionals engaged in social service delivery should be trained together across disciplines so that they can develop shared understandings and better learn to work together as professionals. Coordination in both preservice and inservice preparation needs to carry across academic departmental boundaries for all education personnel, as well as health care and social service professionals.

Knowledge Base for Urban Improvement

The university is one of the few institutions in society with the long-term capacity to generate a knowledge base for the improvement of city life. Knowledge production and utilization about urban themes should be part and parcel of the mission of the urban university. The following five goals reflect this need.

Goal #10: Designing Research on Urban Themes

The design of research on urban themes presents a special challenge. For example, Knapp (1995) examined how to study comprehensive services for children and families. He identified five problems a researcher encounters: a variety of perceptions participants have of the issue; ambiguity of the definition of comprehensive services; ambiguity of outcomes; whether the variables can be isolated sufficiently to determine causality; and the problem of studying processes and outcomes highly sensitive to participants. Similar design problems are associated with many urban issues. Creative designs are needed to explore urban complexities in ways that yield a valid and reliable knowledge base.

Goal #11: Translating Research into Practical Applications

University research is criticized as being too narrow and directed at an audience of specialized peers (Haaland, Wylie, & DiBiasio, 1995), and overemphasizing publications to the detriment of other scholarly responsibilities (Massy & Wilger, 1995). Waetjen and Muffo (1983) found the current university model antithetical to, and ill-organized for, solving broad, complex urban problems. Lynton (1995a, b) argued that traditional university research is unidirectional (i.e., from scholar to practitioner) and no longer applicable to a knowledge based society, which requires a two-way flow between knowledge and practice.

Involvement in the city demands that knowledge production be closely tied to concrete application. The university research model is often found lacking. Some have proposed an urban research approach based on the highly successful land-grant agricultural model (Berube, 1978; Waetjen & Muffo, 1983). Others have said this model is not a good parallel for urban needs insofar as it (a) was based on technical advances in the biological sciences without parallels in the social sciences; (b) dealt with technical problems more amenable to solution than social problems are; (c) operated in less complex political climates with relatively few interest groups; and (d) historically involved relatively new institutions of higher education specially dedicated to the task, whereas urban universities tend to be older and would need to add structures to attack urban problems in the same ways that land-grant colleges have addressed agricultural problems (Carnegie Commission, 1972; Enarson, 1978). There is some agreement, however, that a model different from the traditional university research approach is needed to address urban problems.

Recognizing the limitations of the land-grant model, Hathaway et al. (1995) recommended an urban-based experiment station, using the city as a laboratory, to bring the university's talents to bear on urban problems. Wagner (1995) reported on a 6-year effort by the University of California at Davis to implement a cooperative research and extension model to serve schools. The model employed the

following elements: the use of professional intermediaries between the university and the schools (i.e., education extension specialists, school-site advisors, and practitioner researchers); partnerships involving the research university, its school of education, and schools within four different school districts, three large and one small; and collaborative research and development projects. Wagner also noted that intra-university reforms can provide the occasion to reform relationships with the schools.

Whatever the model, the issue of who determines the nature of research needs to be addressed. Cochran-Smith and Lytle (1992) argued that "teacher research," designed and conducted by teachers about their own classrooms, should be viewed by researchers as legitimate. They found that structures that support teacher research address four critical issues: organizing time, using talk with other teachers, using a broad range of text (not only research journals), and redefining the tasks of teaching. Urban universities need to find ways to involve city practitioners in designing and conducting urban research.

Goal #12: Addressing Intra-University Debates on Research

The research versus teaching debate continues. The traditional position is that faculty have a core academic responsibility to engage in both research and teaching (Rosovsky, 1990), but many have charged that teaching has suffered from an overemphasis on research (Massy et al., 1994). Some studies have found that a focus on research has disengaged faculty from teaching responsibilities and institutional goals (Massy & Zemsky, 1994). Barnett (1992) argued that research and teaching may be incompatible at their root, that a teacher needs critical distance in order to bring a fresh interpretation when teaching about current research.

Some have broadened the definition of scholarship to include the discovery of knowledge, its integration, its application, and its transmission/transformation (Boyer, 1990). According to Lynton (1995b), universities need to view knowledge as an ecosystem--complex, multifaceted, and multi-connected--focused on both outcomes and process. Cole (1993) argued that the real issue is the quality

of teaching and the lack of coherence of the curriculum. However the debate is cast, research is being redefined within the university. Attempts to commit urban universities to additional research on urban issues must be addressed in the context of this debate.

Goal #13: Organizing for Research

How does a university organize for urban research? The traditional answer is through the academic department and the individual work of faculty members and graduate students. The emerging answer is unclear. In the 1960s urban research centers and urban observatories were created to spot and address urban problems, but many failed because of differing perceptions of their roles and intra-university questioning of their standards (Berube, 1978; Carnegie Commission, 1972). Universities need to better coordinate their urban research efforts to avoid duplication, perhaps via a central coordinating unit (Winkler, 1985). Universities must set priorities and follow their strengths to demonstrate distinction in a competitive environment (Cole, 1993). Miles (1994) proposed that each university should begin funding research prospectively, one project at a time. Geiger (1990) suggested that organized research units have an ability to do what academic departments cannot, namely, "operate in interdisciplinary, applied, or capital-intensive areas in response to social demands for new knowledge" (p. 17).

Goal #14: Maintaining Integrity in Research

The 1970s debate over advocacy research or action research is worth revisiting. The concern was that, in their efforts to solve urban problems, some researchers would attempt to serve research sponsors or city officials and not uphold the standards and values of academic inquiry. Friesema (1971) argued that "academics interested in municipal government become captured and coopted (no doubt willingly) by the clients they cultivated . . . ." (p. 6). The Carnegie Commission (1972) warned that "knowledge-creating institutions need a special insulation from the pressures of political and economic interests" and that "involvement with the city can threaten the needed isolation" (p. 3). By

contrast, Berube (1978) argued that the real problem was too *little* advocacy and that university research tended to support the status quo in society. The debate continues today. Noting that dollars flowing to universities from corporate sources had increased from $235 million in 1980 to $1.2 billion in 1991, Soley (1995) concluded that "the ivory towers of America have been leased by corporations, wealthy patrons, and right-wing foundations" (pp. 14-15). Urban universities need to develop safeguards to ensure that academic integrity is upheld as they tackle real-life urban problems.

Essential Services and Model Service Delivery

Urban universities have been pacesetters in providing services to cities (Cisneros, 1995). Universities need to consider the following service-related goals.

Goal #15: Providing Services Most Needed by Clients

Universities engage in an extensive array of public services (Johnson & Bell, 1995). For example, universities annually provides millions of dollars for free and underreimbursed health care for needy neighbors (Cisneros, 1995). The Carnegie Commission (1972) recommended that universities engage only in activities that meet three criteria: revitalizing educational functions as an integral part of educational program; within institutional capacity (personnel and resources); and not duplicative of the services of other city agencies. Urban universities need to adopt criteria to integrate urban education improvement with their core academic missions.

Goal #16: Developing New Models of Service Delivery

Universities have a key role in developing new models of service delivery that can be adopted and implemented by non-university agencies. Many have argued that an urban university should not be offering a direct service to the community unless it is in the context of the university's academic role of developing and testing service delivery models that can be replicated by practitioners in real-life settings.

Goal #17: Coordinating with Other Service Delivery Agencies

If universities are to be part of an integrated, coordinated approach to human service delivery (e.g., Schorr, 1994), specific steps must be taken to build that relationship. Since universities have traditionally seen themselves as fully autonomous units, exemplary models are lacking. Grobman (1988) proposed that universities establish formal functioning relationships with schools and other service delivery entities. Some universities have developed written agreements with their immediate communities, but usually for very specific purposes. The Carnegie Commission (1972) suggested that universities form quasi-university agencies through which faculty and students could funnel their public service efforts without the university's direct corporate involvement.

Goal #18: Coordinating Internal Units

Universities need to determine how best to internally organize their public service efforts. Traditionally, faculty make individual arrangements based on interest or external funding. However, time spent on public service is time that cannot be devoted to other activities such as teaching and research. Leaving initiatives to individuals adds to the fragmentation and isolation of activities, which serve neither the recipients of the service activities nor the university making the investment.

Good Neighbor

Productive community relations require a climate of trust. If nearby residents consider the university a bad neighbor, long-term collaboration is hampered. To create a climate of trust, a university should pursue the following four goals.

Goal #19: Minimizing Disruptions

The Carnegie Commission (1972) suggested two strategies to combat problems associated with university expansion. First, universities should use space more efficiently to decrease their additional space requirements. Second, universities should establish ongoing planning processes in which immediate neighbors are consulted about potential expansion.

Goal #20: Building Partnerships to Increase Neighborhood Capacity

Porter (1995) argued that economic development programs in the inner city are fragmented and provide limited relief. He proposed a strategy for building an economic base in the inner city by exploiting its competitive advantages and through careful business development. The implications for the urban university are: (a) it needs to develop neighborhood business relations through the purchase of goods and services from local vendors and (b) it should provide the technical assistance and training local businesses need to start up and prosper.

Porter's strategy, to depend on private industry rather than government programs to address societal problems, could also have adverse implications for urban universities. He called for reinvestment of dollars away from direct service programs and into business-to-business programs to build the economic infrastructure of inner cities. Since many direct service programs flow through universities under grants and contracts, this could result in a loss of direct dollars to universities.

Goal #21: Concentrating Services and Investments

Some universities aggregate their outreach efforts in a zone near campus. They aim to concentrate the institution's regular activities, such as clinical placement of student teachers or psychologists in training, for maximum benefit to improve adjacent neighborhoods. Other investments, such as in housing development, also can be concentrated near campus. For example, Marquette University developed plans for extensive urban renewal in its immediate neighborhood, including housing renovations through its own for-profit and not-for-profit subsidiaries (Boyce, 1994).

Goal #22: Making On-Campus Facilities and Services Available

The urban university routinely allows local community neighbors access to university facilities and cultural and recreational services and events. This can be a substantial contribution to the immediate neighborhood, in terms of providing space that would otherwise not be available to nearby residents, and absorbing the costs of space use, such as set-up, take-down, and cleaning. This can also

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

create tensions on campus as students and employees compete with outside residents for the use of scarce space, especially athletic and recreational facilities. The urban university needs strategies to manage this tension.

Economic Contributor

Universities are similar to other corporations in generating economic activity for the city (Cisneros, 1995). They are major employers and purchasers of goods and services, and the spending of their students and faculty contributes substantially to the local economy. These activities create second-order effects in the overall economy (Carnegie Commission, 1972).

Goal #23: Developing an Accurate Assessment of Economic Impact

A university must accurately assess its economic impact on a region through careful documentation that includes clear assumptions about the "multiplier" factors used for estimating downstream effects on the economy. This assessment should take a broad view of economic impact, including, for example, hiring, purchases, estimates of taxes paid and calculations of total dollars brought in from outside the city, as well as other less direct impacts, such as the dollar value to the city for the various in-kind services that the community receives from the university through its public service mission. This assessment needs to be well publicized within and outside the university. Internally, this will help coordinate the activities of each member of the university with the institution's overall activities. Externally, the knowledge is useful politically and can build good will for community-based projects.

One complication relates to purchases and contracts with outside vendors. Although a university may be anxious to support local vendors, it also has a fiscal responsibility to get the best price for a good or service. This conflict has no easy resolution, especially since many city employers and vendors are unionized so their costs of doing business may be higher than those of non-unionized firms outside the city.

Stable Organization with a Coherent Policy of Involvement

For the city-university relationship to flourish, the university has to be a stable organization with consistent and coherent policies regarding its relations with the city. Effective university programs to improve inner-city education will be unlikely if the university is unstable, distracted by crises, uncertain about the resources needed to support the efforts, or inconsistent in its urban education policies.

Goal #24: Reengineering the Organization

Universities are reengineering themselves to become more efficient and productive. This effort has four major foci: reducing the overall running rate of the institution (Zemsky & Massy, 1990), becoming more quality and customer-service oriented (Seymour, 1993), becoming more productive (Guskin, 1994), and building in incentives for decentralized units to achieve performance goals (Whalen, 1991). Each has implications for initiatives directed at urban education improvement.

Goal #25: Developing New Organizational Models

In a knowledge-based society universities must reexamine themselves to react to rapidly changing economic, political, and social conditions. Duderstadt (1995) suggested 10 potential paradigms associated with his vision for the 21st-century university, all calling for strategic changes in the mission, functions, and structures of universities in the next century. It is noteworthy that he did not mention a distinctive university paradigm directed at addressing the needs of America's cities.

Some universities have espoused an emergent philosophy: identity as "metropolitan" universities (Johnson & Bell, 1995) dedicated to improving their metropolitan regions. This approach could place less emphasis on the inner city and more on the suburbs with the population bases needed for stable student enrollments. The urban university needs a balanced strategy that employs the strengths of both the city and its greater metropolitan region.

The restructuring strategies any given university chooses will determine its priorities for inner-city education improvement. Through restructuring, universities are redefining their niches. Those who believe an urban education commitment is necessary must engage early in the reengineering discussions if they wish to propose an urban agenda for consideration. Pivotal choices will be made over the next few years (Duderstadt, 1995).

Goal #26: Creating Organizational Structures and Policies to Support Urban Initiatives

With so many potential activities to improve urban education, how does a university (a) organize them to ensure that they are based on the best available knowledge, (b) avoid duplication, and (c) work in unison and for maximum benefit? According to the Carnegie Commission (1972), the university must create formal policies and structures to carry out this function, for example, appoint a senior administrator for city-university relations to be advised by an urban affairs advisory council made up of faculty, students, and administrators. Each university needs to address the organizational and policy issues if urban educational improvement is to be institutionalized.

Open Forum

If urban education is to occur in a nonthreatening atmosphere, there must be safe havens for open discussion on controversial topics. Urban universities have long served as forums for the free exploration of ideas and opinions and as neutral meeting grounds for opponents on various issues (Cisneros, 1995; Klotsche, 1966).

Goal #27: Preserving a Forum for Open Dialog

Serving as a forum for open dialog means protecting free speech on campus no matter what the content. Cahn (1986) expressed the basic principle as follows:

> The maintenance of free inquiry requires that all points of view be entitled to a hearing . . . . No matter how noxious some opinions may be, the greater danger lies in stifling them. When one person's opinion is silenced, no one else's may be uttered in safety. (pp. 5-6)

The urban university, with a diversity of cultures and opinions, needs to preserve itself as an open forum in spite of attacks from every political and intellectual point of view. Concerns over offensive speech and violence against racial/ethnic groups have brought renewed debate over the university's response to tensions between hate speech and free speech (e.g., Ehrlich, 1990). The urban university must develop policies and guidelines protecting freedom of expression on campus, educate the campus community in civility of expression, and guard against inappropriate behavior. DeCew (1990) recommended that policies, guidelines, and programs be constructed in consultation with bipartisan groups to ensure balance and in sufficient detail to provide a guide for action.

Social Critique

The university has historically been the home for social criticism--candid assessments of the status quo and open disagreement with policies and practices that run counter to state-of-the-art knowledge.

Goal #28: Providing an Ongoing Critique

An essential function of an urban university is to challenge the status quo and introduce experimentation and innovation to the urban scene (Klotsche, 1966), particularly urban schools. For example, the critique of pull-out and other categorical programs in special education (Wang, Reynolds, & Walberg, 1995), leading eventually to the regular education initiative, demonstrated how an urban university could respond to long-standing practices conflicting with the emergent knowledge base in basic education. The urban university needs to support this kind of critique, even against entrenched special interests.

Left only to individual faculty or academic departments, a critique is episodic and dependent upon the individual interests of those involved. Universities should consider support for comprehensive centers for the careful review, documentation, and evaluation of urban education against the backdrop of available knowledge on best practice. For example, an annual report on the condition of education

in the city, much like the one developed at the state level in California by the PACE Center (cf. Policy Analysis for California Education, 1989), could be a valuable contribution to a positive critique of urban school practice.

Goal #29: Confronting the Advocacy Problem

In providing social criticism, the urban university must confront the difficult issue of political advocacy. For example, the controversy over *The Bell Curve* (Herrnstein & Murray, 1994) includes questions about the political positions of foundations that supported some of the research underlying the book's conclusions (Miner, 1995). By establishing priorities and policies regarding acceptance of private dollars, universities need to be clear about their standards for research in advocacy of any particular political viewpoint. These policies must be consistent with the values of free inquiry and academic freedom that are cornerstones of the culture of higher education.

Agent of Public Policy

Folger and Jones (1993) proposed that state governments use fiscal policies in support of higher education to further state education goals. Many would consider this approach a danger to stable base funding of higher education. Nevertheless, the mechanism may provide an opportunity for urban institutions to secure support for urban initiatives.

Goal #30: Urban Education Improvement as a Pressing Social Need

Urban education improvement needs to be defined as a pressing social need. Given the competing demands for funding welfare, prisons, and health care, this is a daunting task. Nevertheless, if higher education funding is to be linked to state or federal priorities, seeking to include urban educational improvement in those priorities may be a way to support university involvement in the improvement of urban education.

Goal #31: Linking Public Policy with the Best Knowledge

The tendency is for dollars to be allocated based on political agendas rather than the best science. If public dollars do become available, it is important that they be directed at agendas derived from a knowledge base that is sound and related to desirable goals, such as student outcomes. This means that universities and cities must be in the position to propose agendas for consideration and be ready to take advantage of funding opportunities as they arise.

Part Four: Concluding Remarks

Since institutions of higher education are so diverse, and each is protective of its individual autonomy, there is no simple prescription for every institution. Therefore, this article proposes an agenda of goals: each institution of higher education must address the issues raised in the agenda and take local action. Specific next steps will vary by the situation. Below are some general considerations.

1. An Opportunity for Action

Conventional wisdom says that timing is everything. The time may be opportune to coalesce the needs of the city, the city schools, and the university. Each currently faces serious challenges from both within and outside. As the university seeks to reengineer its basic structures, it may need the city as much as the city needs the university.

2. Reclaiming the Public Trust

Bok (1992) suggested that trust may be gained if universities address problems of importance for society. Perhaps the improvement of urban education is the issue to galvanize the spirit and enthusiasm of the university, the local community, and the general public. After all, urban education improvement is in the long-term interests of everyone. For urban universities, this could be the occasion of a new sense of public purpose that society believes is important and therefore a means of

rekindling the general public's trust and confidence in the university as a critical institution relevant to national needs.

3. Understanding the Context of Urban Education Improvement

A basic thesis of this article is that urban educational improvement must be considered as an initiative within two distinct but related contexts: the structural characteristics of the university itself and the complex set of interactions between the city and the university.

Although the literature is relatively robust regarding the key structural characteristics of American higher education, both historical and emergent, there is little research on the ways structural characteristics affect initiatives such as the improvement of urban education. Do different types of institutional mission and structure affect the success of these initiatives? This is an area needing careful documentation and analysis, especially as institutions restructure themselves.

Similarly, the literature on city-university relations is anecdotal and prescriptive but sheds little empirical light on how university initiatives, such as the improvement of city schools, are affected by the overall nature of the university's relationship with the city. For example, if the university is able to build constructive and positive relations with its neighbors, to what extent does this enhance the success of school improvement initiatives? Would it make more sense for a university to invest in a neighborhood improvement project or in longer term work with the schools? Once again, there is a need for documentation and study, both longitudinally and across institutions, on how the quality of the university's relationship with its host city enhances success of school partnerships.

4. Learning from the Knowledge Base in Basic Education

The knowledge base on teaching and learning is much more developed for basic education than higher education. There needs to be systematic study of what is applicable to both areas and what is unique to higher education. Universities can benefit from a careful analysis of the literature on what works in urban elementary and secondary schools to determine what may be applicable to post-

secondary teaching and learning, and what transition issues need to be addressed to provide a seamless web of education for the urban student.

5. Supporting Research and Service

Three dimensions of university support for inner-city education improvement particularly need to be addressed: allocation of faculty time; determination of total resources contributed; and organizing for urban education improvement.

Reform efforts placing greater emphasis on undergraduate teaching can erode the amount of faculty time available for service and research on the improvement of urban education. Each university needs to determine its priorities and the amount of faculty time it can devote to urban education improvement. Strategies must incorporate urban education improvement into the fabric of undergraduate education improvement. For example, the use of service learning, internships, involving undergraduate students in research projects, and redefining urban education to include a quality college education for urban youth are alternatives for advancing both objectives.

At the same time, data are needed on the resources universities currently devote to urban education improvement. Although there are many descriptions of urban education initiatives in the literature, there is little careful analysis of the level and source of resource commitment. Baseline data might serve a benchmarking purpose. Since competition drives universities, such data may spur additional efforts, and may also be useful in systematic study of inputs and their effects in urban education activities.

The issue of how to organize urban education efforts is still open. The use of an organized research unit and the development of cooperative research and extension programs have their advantages, but research is lacking on the best ways to organize. This needs careful documentation and study, especially in this era of restructuring.

6. Coordinating Activities for a Coherent University Response

The training, research, and service activities of universities on behalf of cities in general and for the improvement of inner-city education in particular are varied, disconnected, and involve numerous actors at all levels of the university. Opportunities may be lost because university units do not know about the activities of others in the very same neighborhood. Each university must address this issue and decide whether the current "loose coupling" approach (which Weick, 1976 argued could be functional for certain purposes) is in the best interests of the university and the clients being served. Given the growing research on the need for coordinating services on behalf of children and families, universities should start with the assumption that greater coordination is desirable unless there are substantive, academic, or client service reasons that suggest otherwise.

7. Addressing the Fragmentation Issue in Higher Education

Higher education is highly fragmented internally--in governance as well as in its delivery of core services. Two reform efforts are currently under way nationally: (a) making the institution more customer oriented, less bureaucratic, and less hierarchically rigid, and (b) delegating to responsibility centers the management of operations. What effects will these approaches have on the capacity and willingness of the university to mount and sustain urban education initiatives? Will movement to responsibility center management create new hierarchical structures with their own rigidity and resistance to interdisciplinary work? Will the emphasis on customer service result in a narrow definition of student satisfaction that does not include service to the local urban community? The ways in which these reforms are implemented may have much to say about the capacity of universities to address the problems of urban education.

One area within the university that needs immediate attention is the delivery of financial aid for university students. Since this directly affects access, and since most agree that high levels of dysfunctional fragmentation exist, especially for lower income students, strategies are needed to

consolidate, simplify, and reorganize financial aid programs, qualification procedures, and the information provided to students and their families.

8. Improving the Training of Education Professionals

High priority must be placed by urban universities on improving the training of education professionals, particularly in two dimensions. First, the preparation of professionals-to-be across fields and departments is imperative. It is simply unrealistic to expect professionals to work together jointly when their preparation programs are fragmented and isolated. Second, Silver's (1983) recommendation that research and training programs of education professionals need to be organized around the problems faced by the clients served rather than around the day-to-day problems of the professional also deserves careful review.

9. The Need for Setting Priorities in a Strategic Fashion

The above agenda is ambitious. Not everything can be done by a single institution (Carnegie Commission, 1972). Each urban university must take charge of its own destiny and set priorities in line with its autonomy. Each university needs to identify its distinctive marketplace niche consistent with its mission. This article has argued that improving inner-city education is an appropriate niche for urban universities.

REFERENCES

Astin, A. W. (1985). *Achieving educational excellence: A critical assessment of priorities and practices in higher education*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Astin, A. W. (1993). *What matters in college? Four critical years revisited*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Barnett, R. (1992). Linking teaching and research: A critical inquiry. *Journal of Higher Education 63*(6), 619-636.

Bender, T. (Ed.) (1988). *The university and the city: From medieval origins to the present*. New York: Oxford University Press.

Berdahl, R. O. (1989). Shared governance and external constraints. In J. H. Schuster & L. H. Miller (Eds.), *Governing tomorrow's campus*. New York: Macmillan.

Berube, M. R. (1978). *The urban university in America*. Westport, CN: Greenwood Press.

Birnbaum, R. (1983). Value of different kinds of colleges. In *Maintaining diversity in higher education* (pp. 1-36). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Bok, D. (1992). Reclaiming the public trust. *Change, 24*(4), 12-19.

Boyce, J. N. (1994, February 1). Marquette University leads urban revival of blighted environs. *The Wall Street Journal*.

Boyer, E. L. (1987). College: The undergraduate experience in America. New York: Harper & Row.

Boyer, E. L. (1990). *Scholarship reconsidered: Priorities of the professorate*. Princeton: The Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching.

Brownell, B. A. (1995). Metropolitan universities: Past, present, and future. In D. M. Johnson & D. A. Bell (Eds.), Metropolitan universities: An emerging model in American higher education (pp. 17-26). Denon, TX: University of North Texas Press.

Bruffee, K. A. (1987). The art of collaborative learning. *Change, 19*(2), 42-47.

Bruffee, K. A. (1995). Sharing our toys: Cooperative learning versus collaborative learning. *Change*, 12-18.

Cahn, S. M. (1986). *Saints and scamps: Ethics in academia*. Totowa, NJ: Roman and Littlefield.

Carnegie Commission on Higher Education. (1972). *The campus and the city: Maximizing assets and reducing liabilities. A report and recommendations*. New York: McGraw-Hill.

Cisneros, H. G. (1995). *The university and the urban challenge*. Washington, DC: U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development.

Cochran-Smith, **initial?**, & Lytle, S.L. (1992). Communities for teacher research: Fringe or forefront? *American Journal of Education*, *100*(3), 298-324.

Cole, J. R. (1993). Balancing acts: Dilemmas of choice facing research universities. *Daedalus*, *122*(4) 1-36.

DeCew, J.W. (1990). Free speech on campus. In S.M. Cahn (Ed.), *Morality, responsibility, and the university: Studies in academic ethics* (pp. 32-55). Philadelphia: Temple University Press.

Dilworth, M. E., & Robinson, S. (1995). K-12 and postsecondary education: Some issues, some consequences. *Educational Record*, *76*(3), 82-89.

Doxiades, C.A. (1969). Cities in crisis and the university. *College and University Bulletin*, *47*(4).

Duderstadt, J. (1995). Academic renewal at Michigan. *Executive Strategies*, *1*, 1-18.

Ehrlich, H. J. (1990). *Campus ethnoviolence and the policy options* (Report No. 4). Baltimore: National Institute Against Prejudice and Violence.

Elliott, P.G. (1994). *The urban campus: Educating the new majority for the new century*. Phoenix, AZ: Oryx Press.

Enarson, H. L. (1978). Review of "The urban university in America," by Maurice R. Berube. *Journal of Higher Education*, 104-105.

Folger, J., & Jones, D. P. (1993). *Using fiscal policy to achieve state education goals: State Pplicy and college learning*. Denver: Education Commission of the States.

Friesema, H. P. (1971). Urban studies and action research. *Urban Affairs Quarterly*, *7*(1).

Gaff, J. G. (1992). Beyond politics: The educational issues inherent in multicultural education. *Change*, 31-35.

Geiger, R. L. (1990). Organized research units--Their role in the development of university research. *Journal of Higher Education*, *61*(1), 1-19.

Green, K. C., & Gilbert, S. W. (1995). Great expectations: Content, communications, productivity, and the role of information technology in higher education. *Change*, *27*(2), 8-18.

Green, M. F. (Ed.) (1989). *Minorities on campus: A handbook for enhancing diversity*. Washington, DC: American Council on Education.

Grobman, A. B. (1988). *Urban state universities: An unfinished national agenda*. New York: Praeger.

Guskin, A. E. (1994). *Reducing student costs and enhancing student learning: The university challenge of the 1990s* (AGB Occasional Paper No. 27). Washington, DC: Association of Governing Boards of Universities and Colleges.

Haaland, G. A., Wylie, N. R., & DiBiasio, D. A. (1995). Faculty and scholarship: The need for change. In D. M. Johnson & D. A. Bell (Eds.), *Metropolitan universities: An emerging model in American higher education* (pp. 99-109). Denon, TX: University of North Texas Press.

Hathaway, C. E., Mulhollan, P. E., & White, K. A. (1995). Metropolitan universities: Models for the twenty-first century. In D. M. Johnson & D. A. Bell (Eds.), *Metropolitan universities: An emerging model in American higher education* (pp. 5-16). Denon, TX: University of North Texas Press.

Healy, P. (1995, May 5). Colleges vs. communities. *Chronicle of higher education*, A27-A32.

Herrnstein, R. J., & Murray, C. (1994). *The Bell Curve: Intelligence and Class Structure in American Life*. New York: The Free Press.

Holmes Group (1986). *Tomorrow's Teachers: A report of the Holmes Group*. East Lansing, MI: Author.

Jayne, E. (1991). Academic Jeremiad: The Neoconservative View of American Higher Education. *Change*, 30-41.

Johnson, D. M., & Bell, D. A. (Eds.) (1995). *Metropolitan Universities: An Emerging Model in American Higher Education*. Denon, TX: University of North Texas Press.

Kerr, C. (1963). *The Uses of the University*. New York: Harper and Row.

Kirst, M. W., McLaughlin, M., & Diane M. (1990). Rethinking Policy for Children: Implications for Educational Administration. In B. Mitchell & L. L. Cunningham (Eds.), *Educational Leadership and Changing Contexts of Families, Communities, and Schools. Eighty-ninth yearbook of the National Society for the Study of Education* (pp. 69-90). Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Klotsche, J. M. (1966). *The Urban University and the Future of Our Cities*. New York: Harper and Row.

Knapp, M. S. (1995). How Shall We Study Comprehensive, Collaborative Services for Children and Families? *Educational Researcher*, 5-16.

Lynton, E. A. (1995a). Forward: What Is a Metropolitan University? In D. M. Johnson & D. A. Bell (Eds.), *Metropolitan Universities: An Emerging Model in American Higher Education* (pp. xi-xxi). Denon, TX: University of North Texas Press.

Lynton, E. A. (1995b). Knowledge and Scholarship. In D. M. Johnson & D. A. Bell (Eds.), *Metropolitan Universities: An Emerging Model in American Higher Education* (pp. 87-98). Denon, TX: University of North Texas Press.

Mason, H. L. (1972). College and University Government. *Tulane Studies in Political Science, 14*. Reprinted in J. L. Bess (Ed.), *Foundations of American Higher Education: An ASHE Reader*. Needham Heights, MA: Ginn Press, 1991.

Massy, W. F., & Wilger, A. K. (1995). Improving Productivity: What Faculty Think About It--And Its Effects on Quality. *Change, 27*(4), 10-20.

Massy, W. F., Wilger, A. K., & Colbeck, C. (1994). Overcoming `Hollowed' Collegiality: Departmental Cultures and Teaching Quality. *Change, 26*(4), 11-20.

Massy, W. F., & Zemsky, R. (1994). Faculty Discretionary Time: Departments and the Academic Ratchet. *Journal of Higher Education, 65*(1), 1-22.

Miles, J. (1994). A Modest Proposal for Saving University Research from the Butcher, *Change, 26*(6), 30-35.

Miner, B. (1995). Who Is Backing "The Bell Curve"? *Educational Leadership, 52*(7), 80-81.

Orfield, G. (1992). Money, Equity and College Access. *Harvard Educational Review, 62*(3), 337-370.

Palmer, P. J. (1987). Community, Conflict, and Ways of Knowing. *Change, 19*(5), 20-25.

Policy Analysis for California Education (1989). *Conditions of Children in California*. Berkeley, CA: School of Education, University of California.

Porter, M. E. (1995). The Competitive Advantage of the Inner City. *Harvard Business Review*, 55-71.

Richardson, R. C., Jr., & Skinner, E. F. (1991). *Achieving Quality and Diversity: Universities in a Multicultural Society*. New York: Maxwell Macmillan.

Rosovsky, H. (1990). *The University: An Owner's Manual*. New York: Norton & Co.

Ruch, C. P., & Trani, E. P. (1995). Scope and Limitations of Community Interaction. In D. M. Johnson & D. A. Bell (Eds.), *Metropolitan Universities: An Emerging Model in American Higher Education* (pp. 231-243). Denon, TX: University of North Texas Press.

Schon, D. A. (1983). *The Reflective Practitioner: How Professionals Think in Action*. New York: Basic Books.

Schorr, L. B. (1994). Looking Ahead: Integrating Urban Policies to Meet Educational Demands. In K. K. Wong & M. C. Wang (Eds.), *Rethinking Policy for At-Risk Students* (pp. 221-238). Berkeley: McCutchan.

Schroeder, C. C. (1993). New Students--New Learning Styles. *Change*, 21-26.

Seymour, D. T. (1993). *On Q: Causing Quality in Higher Education*. Phoenix, AZ: American Council on Education/Oryx Press.

Silver, P. F. (1983). *Professionalism in Educational Administration*. Victoria, Australia: Deakin University.

Sirotnik, K. A. (1995). Making School-University Partnerships Work. In D. M. Johnson & D. A.Bell, *Metropolitan Universities: An Emerging Model in American Higher Education* (pp. 151-160). Denon, TX: University of North Texas Press.

Soley, L. C. (1995). *Leasing the Ivory Tower: The Corporate Takeover of Academia*. Boston: South End Press.

Sykes, C. J. (1988). *ProfScam: Professors and the Demise of Higher Education*. New York: St. Martin's Press.

Task Force on Teaching as a Profession. (1986). *A Nation Prepared: Teachers for the 21st Century*. Washington, DC: The Carnegie Forum on Education and the Economy.

Tinto, V. (1987). *Leaving College: Rethinking the Causes and Cures of Student Attrition*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Trow, M. (1989). American Higher Education--Past, Present and Future. *Studies in Higher Education, 14*(1), 1-52.

Valverde, L. (1985). Low-Income Students. In L. Noel & R. Levitz (Eds.), *Increasing Student Retention*. San Francisco: Jossey Bass.

Waetjen, W. B., & Muffo, J. A. (1983). The Urban University: Model for Actualization. *The Review of Higher Education, 6*(3), 207-215.

Wagner, J. (1995). Research Universities, Schools of Education, and the Schools: A Case Study of Implementing Cooperative Research and Extension in Education. *Educational Policy, 9*(1), 24-53.

Wang, M. C., & Reynolds, M. C. (1995). *Making a Difference for Students at Risk: Trends and Alternatives*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Press.

Wang, M. C., Reynolds, M. C., & Walberg, H. J. (1995). Introduction: Inner-City Students at the Margins. In M. C. Wang & M. C. Reynolds (Eds.), *Making a Difference for Students at Risk* (pp. 1-26). Thousand Oaks, CA: Corwin Press.

Wang, M. C., Reynolds, M. C., & Walberg, H. J. (1994). What Works and What Doesn't Work: The Case for an Inclusive System. In K. K. Wong & M. C. Wang (Eds.), *Rethinking Policy for At-Risk Students* (pp. 151-176). Berkeley: McCutchan.

Weick, K. E. (1976). Educational Organizations as Loosely Coupled Systems. *Administrative Science Quarterly, 21*, 1-19.

Whalen, E. L. (1991). *Responsibility Center Budgeting: An Approach to Decentralized Management for Institutions of Higher Education*. Bloomington, IN: Indiana University Press.

Wingspread Group on Higher Education. (1993). *An American Imperative: Higher Expectations for Higher Education. An open letter to those concerned with the American future*. Racine, WI: The Johnson Foundation.

Winkler, H. R. (1985). The Future Role of the Urban University in Teaching, Research and Public Service. In L. W. Koepplan & D. A. Wilson (Eds.), *The Future of State Universities: Issues in Teaching, Research and Public Service*. New Brunswick, NJ: Rutgers University Press.

Zemsky, R., & Massy, W. F. (1990). Cost containment: Committing to a New Economic Reality. *Change, 22*(6), 16-22.

The National Center on Education in the Inner Cities

The National Center on Education in the Inner Cities (CEIC) was established on November 1, 1990 by the Temple University Center for Research in Human Development and Education (CRHDE) in collaboration with the University of Illinois at Chicago and the University of Houston. CEIC is guided by a mission to conduct a program of research and development that seeks to improve the capacity for education in the inner cities.

A major premise of the work of CEIC is that the challenges facing today's children, youth, and families stem from a variety of political and health pressures; their solutions are by nature complex and require long-term programs of study that apply knowledge and expertise from many disciplines and professions. While not forgetting for a moment the risks, complexity, and history of the urban plight, CEIC aims to build on the resilience and "positives" of inner-city life in a program of research and development that takes bold steps to address the question, "What conditions are required to cause massive improvements in the learning and achievement of children and youth in this nation's inner cities?" This question provides the framework for the intersection of various CEIC projects/studies into a coherent program of research and development.

Grounded in theory, research, and practical know-how, the interdisciplinary teams of CEIC researchers engage in studies of exemplary practices as well as primary research that includes longitudinal studies and field-based experiments. CEIC is organized into four programs: three research and development programs and a program for dissemination and utilization. The first research and development program focuses on the *family* as an agent in the education process; the second concentrates on the *school* and factors that foster student resilience and learning success; the third addresses the *community* and its relevance to improving educational outcomes in inner cities. The focus of the *dissemination and utilization* program is not only to ensure that CEIC's findings are known, but also to create a crucible in which the Center's work is shaped by feedback from the field to maximize its usefulness in promoting the educational success of inner-city children, youth, and families.

CEIC Senior Associates

Margaret C. Wang
Director, CEIC and CRHDE
Professor of Educational Psychology
Temple University

Aquiles Iglesias, Associate Director, CEIC
Associate Professor and Chair,
Speech-Language-Hearing
Temple University

Lascelles Anderson
Professor and Director,
Center for Urban
Educational Research and
Development
University of Illinois
at Chicago

David Bartelt
Associate Professor of
Geography and Urban
Studies and Director,
Institute for Public
Policy Studies
Temple University

William Boyd
Professor of Education
Pennsylvania State
University

Gayle Dakof
Visiting Assistant
Professor of
Counseling Psychology
Temple University

H. Jerome Freiberg
Professor of Curriculum
and Instruction
University of Houston

Michael Goetz
Associate Professor
of Economics
Temple University

Geneva Haertel
Senior Research Associate
CRHDE
Temple University

Howard Liddle
Professor of Counseling
Psychology
Temple University

Maynard C. Reynolds
Professor Emeritus of
Educational Psychology
University of Minnesota

Leo Rigsby
Associate Professor
of Sociology
Temple University

Judith Stull
Associate Professor of
Sociology
La Salle University

William Stull
Professor and Chair,
Department of Economics
Temple University

Ronald Taylor
Associate Professor of
Psychology
Temple University

Herbert J. Walberg
Research Professor
of Education
University of Illinois
at Chicago

Hersholt C. Waxman
Associate Dean for
Research and Associate
Professor of Curriculum
and Instruction
University of Houston

Kenneth Wong
Associate Professor
Department of Education
and Social Sciences
University of Chicago

William Yancey
Professor of Sociology
Temple University

Andrea Zetlin
Associate Professor
Special Education
California State
University, Los Angeles

For more information, contact Jesse R. Shafer, Information Services Coordinator (215/204-3000)